

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 10, 2006. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and entry of the Amendment. Claims 1 to 76 are pending, claim 74 has been amended, claims 1 to 24, 28 and 29 have been withdrawn from consideration, claims 25 to 27, 30 to 73 and 76 have been canceled, and new claims 77 to 83 have been added.

Claims 77 to 83 have been added. Claims 77 to 83 are supported by at least paragraphs 16, 17, 19, 78 and 79 of the application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered.

Claims 25 to 27, 30 to 38, 41, 56, 59 to 69 and 72 to 75 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 5,344,910 to Sybert.

Claims 25 to 27, 30 to 38, 41, 56, 59 to 69 and 72 and 73 have been canceled by this Amendment.

Claim 74 has been amended to claim a 2-aryl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidine instead of a 2-hydrocarbyl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidine. Sybert specifically states in Column 1, line 61 that “copolymers of 2-phenyl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidine) were found to have poor stability during melt processing resulting in foamy melts and discoloration of the resin during melt processing.” Applicants respectfully submit that those skilled in the art would recognize that the “poor stability” and “discoloration of the resin” described by Sybert of the 2-phenyl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidine), which is a member of the 2-aryl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidine family of compounds, could never have resulted in molded parts with low YI values of less than 10, or of less than 2 (as measured by ASTM D1925), as claimed by Applicants in claims 74 and 75. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the results described by Sybert would clearly teach away from the use of 2-phenyl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidine) specifically and the family of 2-aryl-3,3-bis(4-hydroxyaryl)phthalimidines in general by those skilled in the art to produce molded parts with low color. Applicants further believe that producing a polycarbonate copolymer having YIs of less than 10 and less than 2 is a very surprising result in light of the results reported by Sybert.

Applicants therefore believe that the claims 74 and 75, as amended, are not anticipated by, or alternatively, obvious over Sybert and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the

rejection. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 25 to 27, 30 to 38, 41, 56, 59 to 69 and 72 to 75 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 25 to 27, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 3070790.

Claims 25 to 27, 30 and 31 have been canceled by this Amendment. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 25 to 27, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 70 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US 5,344,910 to Sybert in view of US Patent No. 5,910,562 to Miura et al.

Claims 70 and 71 have been canceled by this Amendment. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 70 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 60 to 64 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 60 to 64 and 73 have been canceled by this Amendment. For at least these reasons, Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 60 to 64 and 73 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 25 to 27, 30 to 38, 41, 56, 59 to 75 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18, 19 and 25 to 29 of copending Application Serial No. 11/300,225. Additionally, claims 25 to 27, 30 to 38, 41, 56, 59 to 75 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 to 8 of copending Application Serial No. 11/263,132.

Since these rejections are only provisional at this time, Applicants will address them once all of the remaining rejections have been overcome.

The examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of each of the rejected claims, claims 25 to 27, 30 to 38, 41, 56, and 59 to 75. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 74, 75 and 77 to 83, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted:

VEERARAGHAVAN SRINIVASAN ET AL.

General Electric Company

One Plastics Avenue  
Pittsfield, MA 01201

February 12, 2007

By: /Michelle Bugbee/

Michelle Bugbee, Reg. No. 42,370

Thomas L. Evans, Reg. No. 52,874

Attorney/Agent for Applicants

Customer No. 45,111

Telephone No. (413) 448-7208